



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,077	02/28/2001	Sandro Campestrini	CM 1903/MH	8480

27752 7590 02/12/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1751

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/786,077

Applicant(s)

CAMPESTRINI ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 and 4-15 are pending. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 11/29/02 have been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 9/5/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it lacks the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Note that, Applicant has checked the box on the IDS statement which states that the IDS statement has been filed before the mailing of the first office action and that it was filed along with a Request for Continued Examination; this is not the case. The Office action was mailed out on 8/22/02, the and the RCE was filed 8/14/02 which were both before the filing of the IDS. The box checked on the IDS statement does not authorize charging a fee and, thus, the IDS has not been considered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

2. The following objections/rejections as set forth in Paper #6 have been withdrawn:
None.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaiserman et al (US 5,338,474) for the reasons of record set forth in Paper #4.

Art Unit: 1751

Additionally, Kaiserman et al teach that the system would be useful in normally basic aqueous solutions, in relatively neutral solutions and even in acidic solutions. See column 3, lines 45-55. '621 teaches that the compositions have a pH of from about 3 to about 13. See page 3, lines 1-10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a bleaching composition having the specific pH containing a specific diacyl peroxide which provides stain removal and improved fabric color safety as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Kaiserman et al or '621 suggest such a bleaching composition having the specific pH containing a specific diacyl peroxide which provides stain removal and improved fabric color safety as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1 and 4-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaiserman et al (US 5,338,474) or WO 98/03621 for the reasons of record set forth in Paper #4.

Additionally, with respect to claim 13, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of '621 would suggest a surfactant system in which one is hydrophobic with an HLB of less than 9 and one is hydrophilic with an HLB greater than 10.

Response to Arguments

With respect to Kaiserman, Applicant states that this disclosure is limited to a composition and does not teach a method of removing stains from fabric and improving color safety. In response, note that, in relying upon the theory of inherency, the

Art Unit: 1751

examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied art. Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ 2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990). Once a reference teaching a product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection, and the Examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. See MPEP 2112. In response, note that, the Examiner maintains that the bleaching compositions as taught and suggested by Kaiserman et al would have the same stain removal and fabric color safety properties as recited by the instant claims because Kaiserman et al teach methods of bleaching fabrics using compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims. In fact, various examples disclosed by Kaiserman et al are drawn to cleaning fabrics as recited by the instant claims. Thus, the Examiner maintains that sufficient reasoning and/or evidence has been provided to support the position that the compositions of Kaiserman et al would provide fabric color safety and the burden is now shifted to the Applicant to show otherwise. Additionally, while Applicant argues that Kaiserman et al prefers benzoyl peroxide as the bleaching agent, the Examiner maintains that the teaching of a reference is not limited to the preferred embodiments and Kaiserman et al suggest a method using a composition as recited by the instant claims.

With respect to '621 (Ofosu-Asante) Applicant once again states that the claimed invention discloses a method of using an aliphatic-aromatic diacyl peroxide to deliver

Art Unit: 1751

improved fabric color safety while Ofosu is silent on a method of providing the benefit of fabric color safety. The Examiner maintains that the bleaching compositions as taught and suggested by '621 would have the same stain removal and fabric color safety properties as recited by the instant claims because '621 teaches methods of removing stains from fabrics using compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims. Note that, the reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by Applicant. In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (703) 308-2519. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (703) 308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

GRD
February 10, 2003

GREGORY DELCOTTO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. DelCotto', is written over the printed name and title.